REMARKS

Claims 4, 9 and 14 were canceled. Thus, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yao et al.* (US 2005/0232269). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 6 and 11) recites "in response to a data packet from a first network arriving at a translation router, selecting an appropriate one of said plurality of translation templates from said translation template cache according to an incoming port number from which said data packet comes." Thus, one of the translation templates is selected from the translation template cache based on an incoming port number the data packet comes from.

On pages 2 and 9 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed selecting step is disclosed by *Yao* in paragraphs 27 and 31. In paragraph 31, *Yao* teaches that "the network must implement a systematic method to uniquely identify the port in any of the supported protocols..." (lines 11-12). A master port address translation table is utilized to maintain the type of protocol that the network supports. For example, if the network supports Ethernet, the master port address translation table maintains an Ethernet IP address; if the network supports Fiber Channel, the master port address translation table maintains a Fibre Channel address ID; if the network supports InfiniBand, the master port address translation table maintains InfiniBand local and global IDs; and if the network supports ATM, the master port address translation table maintains the ATM port addresses for each port (lines 15-20). The switch must search through the master port address translation table every time a packet or frame of data is transferred in order to determine the correct destination for the data (lines 20-23). Thus, according to *Yao*, the port address is intended for the destination of a data packet. In contrast, the claimed selecting step is performed "according to an incoming port number from which said data packet comes" (emphasis added). In other words, the translation template is selected based on the source (and not the destination) of the data packet.

In paragraph 27, *Yao* teaches that in order "to send a message or frame from a Fibre Channel port to a Gigabit Ethernet port, the destination port needs to appear as a Fibre Channel port to the source port; and the source port needs to appear as a Gigabit Ethernet port to the destination port" (lines 11-15). In other words, *Yao* simply teaches that when sending a frame from a sender having a Fibre Channel port to a receiver having a Gigabit Ethernet port, the receiver port needs to appear as a Fibre Channel port to the sender port; and the sender port needs to appear as a Gigabit Ethernet port to the receiver port, and it was not an example of an incoming port, as suggested by the Examiner.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Yao*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0456**.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS